

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 6 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter as they are supported by at least paragraph [0038] of the specification, as originally filed. A Request for Continued Examination is filed with this Amendment. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 3, rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 2 is amended to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, are respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 5, rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 6 is amended to remove the ambiguity. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 7, rejects claims 1, 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawatsubashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,285,301 to Shirahashi et al. (hereinafter "Shirahashi"). The Office Action, in paragraph 8, rejects claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawatsubashi in view of Shirahashi as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,506,705 to Yamamoto et al (hereinafter "Yamamoto 1"). The Office Action, in paragraph 9, rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawatsubashi in view of Shirahashi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patents Nos. 5,506,707 to Segawa, 5,657,100 to Yamamoto et al. (hereinafter "Yamamoto 2"), and 6,355,314 to Kubota et al (hereinafter "Kubota"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Sawatsubashi teaches a liquid crystal display device having a driving circuit inside the seal boundary (see Fig. 3). The Office Action, in paragraph 7, recognizes that Sawatsubashi does not disclose a light shielding film on the counter substrate, which is in a non-overlapping arrangement with at least one of the peripheral driving circuit and wiring lines, but rather relies on Shirahashi as allegedly disclosing such a feature. Embodiments of the Shirahashi device are directed to providing a liquid crystal display device wherein the likelihood of breakage of the outermost signal lines is greatly reduced (col. 1, lines 61-65). This is accomplished in embodiments of the Shirahashi device by disposing a dummy line outside the outermost signal line which may include a dummy pixel outside the outermost pixel, the dummy pixel then being masked by a light blocking film (BM) (col. 1, lines 66 - col. 2, line 11).

Claims 1, and in like manner independent claims 2 and 6, are amended to recite, among other features, an active matrix substrate having on the same plane a plurality of scanning lines, a plurality of signal lines provided to intersect the scanning lines, a plurality of pixel electrodes provided at the intersection portions of the scanning lines and the signal lines, and a peripheral driving circuit to matrix drive the pixel electrodes, the peripheral driving circuit including thin film transistors each having a channel region. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Sawatsubashi nor Shirahashi, nor a combination of these references, teaches, nor would it even have suggested, such a feature.

Additionally, dependent claims 5 and 7 are neither anticipated, nor would they have been suggested, by the combination of applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims on independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable features that each of these claims recites.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that none of Yamamoto 1, Segawa, Yamamoto 2 or Kubota overcomes the shortfall in the application of Sawatsubashi and Shirahashi to at least

independent claim 1. As such, the combinations of the applied references cannot reasonably be read to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in at least claims 3, 4 and 6.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-7 as being unpatentable over varying combinations of the applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III

Registration No. 54,734

JAO:DAT

Date: June 28, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--